



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

It is not necessary to go into details. This will be done, I understand, by Hilprecht and Haynes, and all Assyriologists will await with interest the second volume which is to come from them.

In conclusion, I wish again to say that the position of Director of the Expedition was a most difficult one, that the story of the Expedition was a most difficult one to tell, that, while the Director did not do all that he might have done, the same may truthfully be said of each member of the Expedition. I have written frankly, following the example of the Director, and with all its errors of omission and commission, I can honestly recommend this book to all those who are interested in Oriental travels and explorations and excavations in Babylonia. My only regret now is that there was so much contention among the members of the Expedition and that this contention has reached the public.

ROBERT FRANCIS HARPER.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

PERLES' ANALEKTEN.¹

This modest little pamphlet of ninety-four pages is a most important contribution to the text criticism of the Old Testament; and coming at a time when special attention is being accorded to the Hebrew text, with a view to securing greater correctness, it is most timely.

Perles begins by discussing the use of abbreviations in the Talmud and in later Hebrew MSS. Incidentally, in commenting on a curious Talmudic rule, which forbids the writing on the Sabbath day of **א א**, which, as he shows, was an abbreviation of **אמן אמן**, he notices a similar abbreviation on a Carthaginian votive inscription. The most extreme use of abbreviation which he has found occurs in two fragments of Bible MSS. from Egypt, in which the first word of each verse is written in full, but only one letter of each following word. He shows that this method of abbreviation is referred to in the Talmud, and the question considered there whether portions of the Bible so abbreviated might be used for purposes of instruction. He then puts the question: "Since when have the Jews made use of abbreviations, and is it possible that they employed them in their old Bible MSS.?"

Kennicott, followed by Michaelis, Jahn, and others, had already answered this question in the affirmative. Reifmann had also reached the same conclusion, but had applied the principle too broadly, finding abbreviations everywhere, and discrediting his work by his lack of balance. Unfortunately, also, he wrote in Hebrew. Good examples of abbreviations adduced by him are: 2 Kgs. 6:27, **א** for **אם**; Isa. 42:2, **ישא** for **ישאנ**; Ps. 89:51, **כל** for **כלבית**; Job 22:11, **א** for **אור**.

Lagarde says that in the Hebrew text from which the LXX. was translated **ה**, **ס** and **ת** at the end of a word were not written, but indicated

¹ ANALEKTEN ZUR TEXTKRITIK DES ALTEN TESTAMENT, von Dr. Felix Perles. München: Theodor Ackermann, 1895.

by a stroke at the upper end of the preceding consonant. Merx, Grätz, Steinschneider, Workmann, König, and Neubauer have all recognized the use of abbreviations, and treated the question of their existence and character at more or less length. Perles' merit is that out of the facts which others have collected, and to which he adds a large number himself, he has been able to establish principles. He cites a number of dark passages which can, he thinks, be cleared up by the theory of the use of abbreviations, either (1) at the beginning of the word, or (2) by the omission of endings or final syllables.

It was Kennicott who first noticed that the sacred name יהוה was indicated in early MSS. by the abbreviation י'. To the passages which he and others have collected, showing errors arising from a misunderstanding of this abbreviation, Perles adds Ps. 145:12, גבורותי for גבורות י'. Incidentally, in discussing the use of this abbreviation for the tetragram, Perles remarks that the writing י' for יהוה is itself properly an error resulting from the misunderstanding of the original form יי. One is inclined to ask whether the use of יה for יהוה can be in any case a misunderstanding of this abbreviation.

Another abbreviation for יהוה is יה. A good example of the use and ultimate misunderstanding of this abbreviation is Lam. 3:50. Perles brings sense out of this passage by attaching the first word of v. 51, עניי, to the preceding verse as עניי, and reads עולל ה' as עוללה. In Isa. 3:9 he resolves the unintelligible להם into ליהוה=לה'. Here the stroke indicating abbreviation after the letter ה' became ultimately a ם. Similarly in 1 Sam. 3:13 להם is for ליהוה. This change of the mark of abbreviation into the letter ם is quite common. Another example which Perles adduces is Jer. 33:24, where לפנייהם is for לפני ה'. In Ps. 68:20 האל is for אל ה', i. e., יהוה אל.

But with the exception of the tetragram very few words were indicated in the text itself by abbreviations. Glosses were, however, entered on the margin, or between the lines, containing abbreviations, and these glosses ultimately crept into the text. So, in Ezek. 21:20, the letters אה are an abbreviation of the two words which preceded them in the text; namely, אבתה חרב. The glossator wrote this gloss: עשויה לברק=אה. Later the gloss crept into the text, abbreviation and all. (This is originally Reifmann's suggestion.) In 2 Sam. 1:18 the unintelligible קשת arose in the same way from a gloss, קינת שאות=ק"ש. Later the glossator's abbreviation crept into the text and was supposed by some scribe to stand for the word קשת, and completed by him accordingly. Perles points to the Vulgate planctum as supporting this suggestion.

1 Sam. 9:12. Taking this passage, which Lagarde has emended from the LXX. into יש לפניך מזהר, Perles points out that in the LXX. the word הראה is wanting, and that in the Masoretic text there is a *pesiq* after the word מזהר, which, as Olshausen has shown, is frequently put after words or phrases which are not properly part of the text in the opinion of the Masoretes. The ה' of מזהר is really a marginal abbreviation of הראה, taken from the preceding verse. Perles very acutely

suggests that this marginal gloss having crept into the text, albeit with a *pesiq*, was later formed into a word by some scribe who assigned to it as a first letter the final ם of the preceding לפניכם.

It was in proper names that abbreviations, and consequently mistakes, were most common. Perles points out a curious series in Canticles. The father of the Shulammitte was named עמינדב, which was abbreviated to 'ע'נ. This latter abbreviation was interpreted by the Masoretes in 7:7 as ענוגים. Perles would read אהבה בת עמינדב as אהבה בת ענוגים. In 7:2, following the LXX., he would read עמינדב for נריב, and in 6:12, in מרכבות עמי נריב he finds again בת עמינדב.

He shows further that there were in use in the Hebrew a few abbreviations for common words, like בע' for בעוד or בעבור; 'י' for יאם; 'ה' for הנם; 'ב' for בא; and perhaps 'א' for ארץ and 'י' for יום, which have resulted in errors in our present text, either because they have been incorrectly filled out, or because they have been treated as single letters and incorporated into the preceding or following words.

Comparing Ps. 18:28 and 2 Sam. 22:28, Perles points out that the אתה עם of the former is unquestionably correct, and that in the אתה עם of the latter the *makkef* represents an original mark of abbreviation, אתה for 'את. This he shows to be quite a common error, giving examples of a number of passages where a *makkef* represents an original mark of abbreviation, indicating the loss of one or more letters. Abbreviation by omission of endings, such as ה, ך, ך, ך, etc., was very common. At the time when the LXX. translation was made such omissions were marked by a sign of abbreviation, but there was a time when this was not done, and both stages have left their mark in the Masoretic text.

In filling out the lacunae indicated by the marks of abbreviation mistakes were sometimes made, and Perles points out instances in which ית has been written for ה (2 Kgs. 23:13); ך for ך (Hos. 7:6); ך for ך (Ps. 106:43); ך for הם (Job 17:6); ך for ך (2 Sam. 17:12), etc.

Sometimes the abbreviation of end syllables was pushed a little further, and a final stem consonant was omitted. This occurs most frequently in the case of the weak letters א, נ and ת, but there are also plenty of examples of the loss of strong consonants, such as אם אש להמן (2 Sam. 14:19) for אם אשוב להמן. As in the case of omitted endings, this resulted not infrequently in the supplying of incorrect final consonants by the scribes. So in Eccl. 7:28, ערד 'אש' was completed by a scribe as ערד אשר instead of ערד אשה. In Judg. 12:6 'יכ' became in the Masoretic text יכל, whereas in Vulgate and Peshitto it is יכין. In 1 Sam. 17:32 'אד was written out in the Hebrew as אדם, instead of אדוני, which latter form appears in the LXX. Many of the passages which Perles cites under this head had been already correctly emended by others; his merit is to have discovered the cause underlying the errors, and thus established a critical principle. There are also examples of the opposite character, which he cites, where the Masoretic scribes have supposed a mark of abbreviation where none really existed,

but these are less common. This section of Perles' little treatise is peculiarly suggestive and valuable.

In the second section he deals with errors resulting from the division of letters into words. Against Workmann and Cornill he holds, basing his position on the Siloah, Mesa, and Phoenician inscriptions, and on Jewish coins, that there was from the outset a division of words. Lines often ended, however, in the middle of a word, and the separated letters of such a word were sometimes incorrectly joined by scribes to a preceding or following word, as the case might be. Sometimes, also, the scribes supposed an abbreviation, when there were only one or two letters at the end of a line, and supplied extra letters accordingly, thus producing a form of dittography. By comparison with a Punic inscription he concludes that at an early period after abbreviations there was no word-divider, the abbreviation being indicated by its absence. This led occasionally to the attachment of an extra letter or two, really an abbreviation of a word, to a preceding or following word. When custodes were introduced at the end of lines or columns this gave rise to still a different class of errors. In addition to all these are the cases where an original word-divider was overlooked by a scribe, or a false division made by accident. The examples which Perles gives of text corruptions under all these different heads are extremely interesting. The following will serve as specimens:

Hos. 7:6, בַּעֲרֵבם for בָּעַרְבָם. Here the word-divider was overlooked, and two words run into one, and then in the effort to make sense an ע changed into נ.

Job 36:33 is an example of the opposite error. Here the word-divider has become a *makkef*, עַלְעֻלָּה for עַל-עֻלָּה, "storm," "whirlwind," a word which is found in both the western and the eastern Aramaic, although not elsewhere in Hebrew.

Isa. 44:7, מְשַׁמֵּי עִם עֻלָּם, is a case where the line division cut off one letter from the end of a word, which the scribe later joined to the first letter of the following word in the line below to make a new word. It should be divided מְשַׁמֵּי מֵעֻלָּם. Similarly in Jer. 23:33, as the LXX. also testifies, אֵת מִה מִשָּׂא should be divided אֵתָם הַמִּשָּׂא. This is one of the passages which supports Perles' contention, that the differentiation of final forms as such in the letters ם, ץ, etc., is very late.

In the case of Habakkuk 1:10, where, as Wellhausen has shown, the ן of מִטֵּל should be dropped, the original text read כְּלָאוּ שְׁמִי|ם טֵל שְׁמִי, i. e., the final ם of שְׁמִי was at the beginning of the next line. The scribe supposed שְׁמִי to be an abbreviation for שְׁמִיִּם and supplied the ם accordingly. The ן on the following line he then connected as a preposition with the following word.

Sometimes only the first letter of a word stood on one line, the remainder being on the line below. In this case the solitary letter was in danger of being attached to the word before it. Among other examples of this, Perles adduces Eccl. 7:19, where, out of an original מַעֲשֵׂר

עשרה|שליטים, with the line division after the ה, a scribe made עשרה שליטים. By correcting this to מעשר השליטים he obtains a new and more satisfactory sense for the verse.

In Isa. 26:19 he finds an example of dittography resulting from the treatment of custodes as part of the text. נבִּלְתִּי יְקוֹמֶהוּ is shown by the parallelism to be an error for יְקוֹמֶהוּ נבִּלְתִּי. The error arose from the fact that after נבִּלְתִּי, the last word in one line, was written as custos י, the first letter of the first word in the next line. This custos a scribe treated as a separate letter, and added to נבִּלְתִּי. For a proof that custodes were thus used at the end of a line, Perles refers to the Codex Petropolitanus (10th century A. D.). A dittography which he finds in Hos. 12:10, כִּימִי מוֹעֵד, for כִּימִי עַד, "as in days of old," cannot possibly be referable to this cause, as he supposes; but the correction itself, which he supports from the Targum and from Mic. 7:14, seems to be a good one. It would seem more likely that the lines were divided כִּי|מִיֵּעַד, and that a scribe later wrote on the upper line the rest of the word כִּימִי, without carefully erasing the מִי at the beginning of the line below. A succeeding scribe found, therefore, כִּימִי מִיֵּעַד out of which he very naturally made כִּימִי מוֹעֵד, which we have in our text. Or else it is due to another practice of which he adduces no examples, the repetition of the last word of one column at the beginning of the next.

Of course there are examples also of the opposite error, where scribes supposed a letter to be a custos when it was not, and omitted it accordingly. A good example of this is 1 Sam. 13:8, where לְמוֹעֵד אֲשֶׁר שָׁם שְׂמוּאֵל must have stood in the original text, but the שָׁם has been omitted, apparently because, finding it at the end of one line, with שְׂמוּאֵל at the beginning of the next, a scribe mistook it for a custos and omitted it.

2 Chron. 11:2. וַיִּשְׁאֹל לָהֶם נָשִׁים וַיִּשְׁאֹל הַמֶּלֶךְ הַזֶּה נָשִׁים (cf. Ruth 1:4). וַיִּשְׁאֹל was abbreviated to וַיִּשְׂא and no word-divider was placed after it. A scribe therefore made the error of attaching ל to וַיִּשְׂא, making וַיִּשְׂאֵל. The same or a later scribe, supposing the הֵם to be an abbreviation, completed it into הַמֶּלֶךְ. This sounds almost too ingenious, but it certainly results in a rational emendation.

A number of the *kethib* readings corrected in *keri* belong, according to Perles, to the same general category of errors resulting from the omission of the word-divider after an abbreviated word, thus: בָּנָה (Gen. 30:11) for *keri* בָּנָה גֵּר.

The third section takes up errors arising from the similarity of certain letters to one another, and considers first what are referable to the ancient characters and what to the later square characters. He adduces a dozen or more new examples under these two heads. In this section he discusses incidentally the date of the adoption of the square characters. In opposition to the view of Blau, that this took place at or about the Hasmonaean period, he endeavors to show that it took place long before the LXX. translation of the Old Testament was made, and that

the square characters must have been in use as early as the 3d century B. C. This discussion is not satisfactory, his material being insufficient.

Section IV. deals with errors arising from false vocalization, especially errors arising from the omission of ׀ and ך. Section V. deals with scribal confusions of letters of similar sounds, especially ך and ם. Section VI. is entitled "Grammatisches und Lexikalisches" and Section VII. "Veschiedenes." An index at the end of this little pamphlet gives a list of passages considered, some hundreds in all. Examining this one finds that Psalms heads the list for number, with 58 passages, and Isaiah follows with 44. There are only seven passages cited from the Pentateuch, an evidence of the greater accuracy of the text of the Law, and incidentally of the earlier canonization of that portion of the Old Testament.

This little book is such a valuable contribution to the study of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament that it should be in the hands of every student of the text.

JOHN P. PETERS.

ST. MICHAEL'S CHURCH,
New York.

COWLEY AND NEUBAUER'S HEBREW ECCLESIASTICUS.¹

The libraries, the scrap-baskets, and now and then a *genizah*, in the old East are fruitful sources of leaves and manuscripts of first interest to the student of oriental lore. Mrs. Lewis and her sister have struck Klondike-treasures in the literary field, and have started a wave of research among the buried and hidden mines of unopened localities.

The stray leaf of Ecclesiasticus (chaps. 39:15-40:7), which Mr. Schechter presented a year ago (in *The Expositor*, July 1896) is quickly followed by the discovery, among a lot of MSS. procured by Professor Sayce, of several leaves continuing the same to 49:11. These leaves, though continuing the same text, are not a part of the same MS., since they are not, as the single leaf, provided with vowel points and accents. There are some marginal notes, giving variants of one or two other copies. These, however, are missing in some of the leaves.

The editors of this little work have given us a beautiful edition of (1) the Hebrew text (with two facsimiles only) transcribed from the MS., occupying the upper half of the right-hand page, (2) an English translation following the diction of the Revised Version of the Old Testament version on the upper half of the left-hand page, (3) the Syriac Version, according to Lagarde's edition, on the lower half of the right-hand page, (4) the Greek according to Swete's edition on the lower half of the left-hand page. The variations and omissions and additions are indicated by series of dots and parentheses and blank lines. To these are appended

¹THE ORIGINAL HEBREW OF A PORTION OF ECCLESIASTICUS (39:15-49:11), together with The Early Versions and an English Translation, followed by The Quotations from Ben Sira in Rabbinical Literature. Edited by A. E. Cowley, M.A., and Ad. Neubauer, M.A. With two facsimiles. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1897. Quarto; xvii + 41 pp.